DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 366 UD 030 280

AUTHOR Goldring, Ellen B.; Bauch, Patricia A.
TITLE Teacher Empowerment and Parent Participation in Urban High Schools of Choice: Consumerism or Partnership?
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 66p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Catholic Schools; Conflict; Decision Making; Educational Change; *High Schools; Magnet Schools; *Parent Participation; Parent Teacher Cooperation; *Partnerships in Education; Professional Autonomy; Public Schools; *School Choice; School Restructuring; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Parent Empowerment; *Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT

Teacher empowerment and parent participation in school decision making have become dominant themes in the current debate over school restructuring. The literature suggests that as teachers become empowered, they may tend to view parents more as clients of education rather than as partners, thereby introducing a potential conflict into the social interaction of teachers and parents. This study examines the interrelationships between teacher empowerment and parent participation in three different types of schools of choice. Data is drawn from a national sample of six Catholic, four single-focus magnet, and five multi-focus magnet public urban high schools in Chicago (Illinois), Washington, D.C., and Chattanooga (Tennessee). Three models of parent-teacher relations are hypothesized: (1) teacher professionalism; (2) parent empowerment; and (3) dual empowerment or partnership. Findings suggest that Catholic schools are closer to the development of a partnership model than either of the two types of public schools. Multi-focus magnet schools most nearly approximate a parent empowerment model. None of the types approximates a teacher professional model of teacher-parent relations. Six tables and an appendix portray some school characteristics. (Contains 104 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 366

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND PARENT PARTICIPATION IN URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS OF CHOICE: CONSUMERISM OR PARTNERSHIP?

by

Ellen B. Goldring

Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

Patricia A. Bauch

The University of Alabama

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P A Bauch
Univ of Alabama

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1994

ED 030 280

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Teacher empowerment and parent participation in school decision making have become dominant themes in the current debate over school restructuring. The literature suggests that as teachers become empowered, they may tend to view parents more as clients of education rather than as partners thereby introducing a potential conflict into the social interaction of teachers and parents. This study examines the nature of the interrelationships between teacher empowerment and parent participation in three different types of schools of choice. We draw our data from a national sample of Catholic, single-focus magnet, and multi-focus magnet public urban high schools in three states. We hypothesize three models of parent-teacher relations: teacher professionalism, parent empowerment, and dual empowerment or partnership. Findings from the study suggest that Catholic schools are closer to the development of a partnership model than either of the two types of public schools. Multi-focus magnet schools most nearly approximate a parent empowerment model. None of the school types approximate a teacher professional model of teacher-parent relations in these schools of choice.

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND PARENT PARTICIPATION IN URBAN SCHOOLS OF CHOICE: CONSUMERISM OR PARTNERSHIP?

Introduction

Teacher empowerment and parent participation in school decision-making have become dominant themes in the current debate over school restructuring (Conley, 1991; Johnson, 1990). Beginning in the late 1970s, public attention shifted from a focus on academic content and higher standards for students and teachers to initiatives that address the fundamental social relationships that define the nature of schooling. These initiatives include school-based management, teacher participation in school decision-making, and parental choice (Conley, 1991; Raywid, 1990). Under these initiatives, teachers, and in some cases parents, have opportunities to become empowered as they participate in governing bodies, local school councils, and advisory boards (Conley, 1991; Malen & Ogawa, 1988; Smylie, 1992). Parents who choose the school their child will attend, also exercise "consumer empowerment."

Restructuring involves a redefinition of roles and relationships in schools and a redistribution of power. The underlying assumption of restructuring as a reform strategy is that changing the roles of teachers and parents will lead to a partnership that can enhance schooling for all children (Elmore, 1990; Johnson, 1990). However, models of teacher professionalism

suggest that as teachers become empowered they may tend to view parents as clients of education, rather than as partners (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). Attempting to protect their professional autonomy, teachers may resist parent participation. Despite this concern, reforms underway in many countries advocate both raising the professionalism and power of educators and intensifying parent involvement (Macbeth, 1993), introducing a potential conflict into the social interaction of teachers and parents.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the nature of the interrelationships between teacher empowerment and parent participation in schools of choice. Specifically we ask, Does teacher empowerment and parent involvement go hand and hand? This study was conducted in three types of urban high schools of choice: Catholic, single-focus public magnet, and multi-focus public magnet in three metropolitan areas serving a large proportion of minority and low income students.

Parent-Teacher Relations in Schools of Choice

The importance of parental involvement in schools is not a new phenomenon. The "effective schools research" documented that parent participation is a crucial component of school improvement (Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis & Ecob, 1988; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Effective schools provide opportunities for parents to both support and participate in their children's education (Smith & O'Day, 1991). Evidence suggests that some forms of parental involvement positively impact student achievement and motivation for some types of students (Henderson, 1987; Jaynews &

Wlodkowski, 1990; Madigan, 1994). Implications drawn from this research emphasize the need to expand opportunities for collaborative planning among teachers, parents, and school administrators; foster flexible improvement strategies that reflect the uniqueness of each school; and address the needs of individual students (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Parental involvement can mean many things. Typically, parental involvement is viewed in a rather traditional manner, whereby parents are largely concerned with their own children's education and well-being. They participate ". . . to support the largely taken-for-granted value system of the school," and are concerned with activities, such as fundraising and social events, that do not involve them in the core educational activities of the school (Munn, 1993, p.1).

This type of parental involvement relegates school governance to educators and the educational system. Many teachers find this arrangement consistent with their view of themselves as professionals, with the knowledge and experience to run their classrooms with autonomy and discretion (Lortie, 1975). Seeley (1989) refers to this as the delegation model of schooling whereby well-trained professionals are expected to make the day-to-day technical decisions that drive the organization and insure provision of high-quality services for all.

Restructuring efforts have put into place mechanisms to change this traditional relationship between parents and teachers. The roles of parents are beginning to expand into new

arenas while simultaneously the roles of teachers are also changing (Murphy, 1991). Some of the new roles for parents include that of customer or consumer of educational services as opportunities for school choice expand. In addition, parents are assuming new roles in school governance as they are empowered to participate in decision making forums. Simultaneously, local school districts are being called on to find ways of "giving teachers a greater voice in school decisions" (Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). This creates a tension between teachers and parents in assessing their respective roles.

New Roles for Teachers and Parents

In schools of choice, there is a tendency to change the bureaucratic pattern of formally defined and specified roles to more flexible role definitions (Raywid, 1990). In the establishment of such schools it is likely that new authority is transferred to a local school site whereby program planners are given responsibility for developing a distinctive program with a unique identity. As teachers work together to evolve a mission for their school, they must work out curriculum decisions, devise learning activities, and frequently collaborate with administrators in the development of school policy (Raywid, 1990). Likewise, because of the possible consumer relationship that schools of choice establish with students and thus with parents, they are more likely to assume broader and more varied roles than in non-choice schools (Blank and others, 1983; Raywid, 1990).

The nature of these new roles, both as they apply to school choice and site-based management plans, has been broadly discussed in the literature on teacher professionalism and empowerment (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1990; Lieberman, 1988), and the literature on participatory decision making and site-based management (e.g., Conley, 1991; Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990; Marburger, 1985). It is not at all clear from the literature how teacher professionalism and teacher empowerment are related to one another and how increased parent interactions may mitigate the teacher role.

Teacher professionalism and empowerment

Discussions about teacher professionalism often center on issues of money, status, and teacher autonomy without focusing on the unique needs of students and accountability to the public (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Sykes, 1990). Darling-Hammond (1990) argues that professionalism must be built on sound principles of conduct and governance of an occupation, a set of principles that is client-driven and knowledge-based. For teachers, this means a defined body of knowledge about teaching practice, respect and concern for the welfare of students, and enforcement of professional standards and ethics.

Currently schools are not organized to support such principles and modes of accountability. Rather, the bureaucratic organization of schooling and teaching requires practice that is procedure-oriented and rule-based (Garman & Hazi, 1988; Glickman, 1987). Often teachers function more as technocrats who comply

with job scripts and task specifications that are highly standardized than as professional decision makers who take individual or collective responsibility for student learning. Nonetheless, teachers have viewed themselves historically as possessing a body of knowledge about the professional practice of teaching and possessing a level of individual autonomy regarding classroom decision-making (Lortie, 1975).

Another view of professionalism considers the incorporation of elements of professionalism into a collaborative culture of schooling that supersedes any one individual teacher's expertise or classroom autonomy. It focuses on student learning and collective school responsibility for student outcomes based on a continuing process of teacher development and socialization into a wide range of responsibilities that extends beyond classroom instruction (Lieberman, 1988; Sykes, 1990). This type of professionalism is often referred to as teacher empowerment because it involves them in the greater decision-making authority that often impedes sound teaching practices. If teachers are to take direct responsibility for their own learning, Lieberman (1988) argues, then all teachers, not just a few career teachers, must be empowered in making faculty-wide decisions supported by the principal in matters of curriculum, instructional methods, school climate, communication with and involvement with parents, selection and assignment of teachers, staff development, teacher evaluation, and resource allocation. Teacher empowerment implies

a lessening of individual teacher autonomy in favor of collaborative decision making among a group of educators.

In adopting new roles of decision making, various levels of teacher empowerment are possible. Bacharach and Lawler (1980) distinguish between two critical dimensions of power in decision making: authority and influence. Authority deals with the ability of an organizational member to make decisions governing others. Influence is a more limited form of decision making in which members have the capacity to shape decisions through informal or nonauthoritative means. Even less limited are the opportunities school leadership may provide for teachers to influence decisions; yet, teachers may choose not to exercise that influence. In organizational models that deliberately structure teacher involvement in school-wide decision making, teachers are given significant access to power (Hallinger & Richardson, 1988). Conley and Bacharach (1990) found that in site-based management plans, many decisions are made by building administrators who operate bureaucratically (i.e., do not delegate authority), rather than by the professional staff through the redistribution of authority to teachers in the decision-making process.

Malen, et al. (1990) define site-based management as a process where "....some formal authority to make decisions in the domains of budget, personnel, and program is delegated to and often distributed among site-level actors. Some formal structure (e.g., council, committee, board, team) often composed of

principals, teachers, parents, and, at times, students and community members is created so that site participants can be involved in school-wide decision making" (p. 290).

Similarly, Marburger (1985) defines school-based management as a decentralized form of organization in which the power and the decisions now made by the superintendent and school board are shared with those who are closest to the students--teachers, the principal, parents, citizens, and students at each local school. While the literature acknowledges the tension that can be created at the local school level between administrators and teachers in deciding the extent of teacher participation, whether that of authority or influence, and the delineation of who makes what decisions, little is stated about the possible tension that could develop between teachers and parents in these same matters (Lieberman, 1988; Clune & White, 1988). The call for teacher empowerment frequently ignores the role of parents in participatory decision making, both the extent and type of decisions in which parents should be involved.

Parent involvement

Parent participation and empowerment are two possible ways in which parents can be involved in schools and in which they can exercise influence and control. Participation refers to the involvement of parents in providing input or being consulted about school affairs or their children's progress without exercising control. Empowerment refers to the parents' role in exercising control within a school, typically through decision

making forums, and is usually accompanied by legitimated sources of power and authority (Goldring & Shapiro, 1993; Saxe, 1975). Parent involvement has gone through numerous changes in recent years.

Parent involvement has evolved from respect for teacher authority and professional expertise into a multiplicity of roles that range from fundraising to participation on school governance councils. The development of school bureaucracy and the increased emphasis on the teacher-as-expert notion of teacher professionalism reduced the historic influence of parents on public schooling (Hiatt, 1993). Increasingly, as Coleman (1987) argues, parents, particularly the increasing numbers who are well educated, are more inclined to criticize teachers, to undercut their authority, and to hold them in low regard. New fiscal and demographic realities combined with rising calls for accountability are beginring to change traditional patterns of parent involvement.

Epstein (1989) outlined five types of parent involvement that have been familiar to educators and parents. The effects on student learning and school improvement of four of these five types of parent involvement have been well-documented in the research literature. They represent the traditional forms of parent participation: (1) the basic obligations of parents to ensure children's health and safety; (2) the basic obligations of the school to communicate with the home about school programs and the child's progress; (3) parent involvement at schools,

including volunteering, and school attending events; and (4) parent involvement in learning activities at home. The fifth type is widely described and discussed, but little research evidence exists establishing its effect on student learning and school improvement; that is, parent involvement in governance and decision-making roles such as committees, advisory councils, and other groups; and as community activists monitoring the school and working for school improvements.

The literature defining site-based management stresses this latter role of parents; that is, their governance role in assuring that all teachers are highly competent and care about children. However, changing the historic role of parents has been problematic. Hill and Bonan (1991) found that in most schools, parents formed an attentive and sometimes critical audience for staff performance. Few parent groups tried to assume day-to-day control of a school or exercise veto power over staff actions. They preferred to hold staff accountable, as they would other professional service providers whom they encountered, but not to dictate the terms of professional practice. Parents on site-councils rarely gave input on the central subjects of budget, personnel, and programs. Malen and Ogawa (1988) found that parent reluctance was based on their lack of information about school activities and school operations, their unclear understanding of the parameters of their power, and their unwillingness to express their preferences. Parents were uncomfortable questioning professionals. Malen and Ogawa (1988)

attribute some of parents' unwillingness to the fact that parents were invited to serve on councils, not elected, thereby serving at the pleasure of school administrators. The difficulty of involving parents in school-wide decision making is undoubtedly related to the professional culture of the school and parents' reluctance to violate the professional norms of school culture. It is likely the case, as Malen et. al. (1990) observe, that while school-based management creates opportunities for parents to be involved in school-wide decisions, there is little evidence that professional-client relationships are altered substantially.

Parent-Teacher Interactions Under Changing Governance Structures

Under conditions of the legal transfer of authority to parents and parent activism, parents are more likely to hold teachers and principals accountable for what goes on in the schools. Hess (1991) refers to the school reform plans involving parents in school governance in Chicago as parent-dominated school-based management. Some would argue that school-based management under lay control is the reverse of teacher professionalism in decision making, but this seems to imply a greater degree of authority and influence in institutional decision making than local school councils actually exercise (e.g. Hess, 1991).

The creation of choice plans among and within school districts in the 1980s provided parents with an alternative avenue to exercise control. Special purpose schools, usually smaller in size; and magnet schools, frequently associated with

desegregation efforts, allowed opportunities for parents to choose the school their child would attend. It was thought that competition through the marketplace would generate a desire for local school improvement (cf., Coons & Sugarman, 1978; Friedman & Friedman, 1980; Lieberman, 1989). Such plans have been fraught with criticism including fears that choice schools will cream off the most elite students relegating poor students to inferior schools (Moore & Davenport, 1989). Although Chubb and Moe (1990) have been highly criticized for advocating market-driven schools, they nonetheless recognize that bureaucratic control and lack of school autonomy hinders the school improvement process. Even where choice is provided, evidence exists that some parents make an initial choice of a school and then delegate responsibility to the school for their child's education exempting their own involvement (Bauch, 1989; Schneider & Slaughter, forthcoming). Research to date does not support the expected results in improved student achievement that either choice plans nor the establishment of parent-dominated school councils were intended to achieve (Rolf, 1990; Bryk, Easton, Kerbow, Rollow, & Sebring, 1993, 1994; Witte, Bailey, & Thorne, 1993).

Neither teacher empowerment nor parent control of the policies and functions of schooling alone seem likely to bring about the desired improvement in student learning. Rather, a partnership model of parent-teacher relations whereby parents and teachers are empowered to work together to foster critical behaviors such as collaborating, planning, communicating, and

evaluating holds out future promise (Epstein & Dauber, 1991; Swick, 1991).

Some efforts are being made to enhance attempts to redefine the role of parents as partners. Chrispeels (1991) describes the policies developed in San Diego that pay particular attention to the needs of parents not typically involved in education. These include (1) involving parents as partners in school governance, including shared decision making and advisory functions; (2) establishing effective two-way communication with all parents, respecting the diversity and differing needs of families; (3) establishing strategies and programmatic structures at schools to enable parents to participate actively in their child's education; (4) providing support and coordination for staff and parents to implement and sustain appropriate parent involvement from kindergarten through grade 12; and (5) using schools to connect students and families with community resources that provide educational enrichment and support (pp.368-69). Other programs have also engaged parents more fully as partners. The most noted programs include the "Comer" schools developed by James Comer of Yale University, the "Accelerated" schools developed by Henry Levin of Stanford University, and the "Essential Schools" developed by Theodore Sizer of Brown University. These and other programs have adopted the principle that schools cannot be successful without the active participation of parents. "It is not the specific activities that are the key to achieving this goals as much as the ability

of the staff and parents to create what they jointly see as a collaborative community learning center" (Conley, 1993, p.216).

Taken together, these new roles of teacher empowerment and parent participation suggest very different interrelationships between teachers and parents. Three models of interrelationship seem to emerge: a teacher professional model in which teachers are empowered to make authoritative decisions either individually or collaboratively with other school personnel, a parent empowerment model in which parents have a significant influence on teacher decision making, and a dual empowerment or a partnership model whereby both teachers and parents exercise decision making authority together.

The first two, the teacher professionalism and parent empowerment models assume an imbalance in relationship to power; one group's gain comes at the expense of another group, while the dual empowerment or partnership model implies that there can be greater power and influence for both sides and the educational system as a whole when power is exercised collaboratively (Golby, 1993; Lieberman, 1988). These models are illustrative at best and help us frame the problem of balancing teacher and parent authority which we wish to investigate. They do not exhaust all possible interrelationships between parents and teachers and in reality, they most likely interact with each other in a school setting.

Three Models of Parent-Teacher Relations

One model exemplifying the interrelationships between parents and teachers given these roles is the *teacher professional model*. According to this model, teachers would be expected to have high levels of professionalism; that is, knowledge and expertise concerning teaching and learning, while parents would primarily be patrons or "indirect clients" of the school. As clients, parents would be minimally active or involved, generally in a supportive role to the school. This model would predict that professional autonomy, including teacher empowerment at the school level, could be in direct conflict with active parent involvement (Lightfoot, 1981; Lindle & Boyd, 1989).

Some studies suggest that teacher professionalism might be associated with low levels of parental involvement. Bauch (1988) found that parents who trust teachers' professional ability are less likely to be involved in schools. Williams and Stallworth (1982) report that teachers support certain types of parental involvement but not empowerment in decision-making, while Clarke and Williams (1992) found teachers with more seniority, and presumably greater expertise, place less importance on parental involvement. In a study of teacher and parent attitudes toward parent involvement, Montandan (1993) found that the great majority of teachers had a negative attitude toward parent involvement, even though half of the parents were interested in collaboration with teachers in making school decisions.

It should be noted that under choice arrangements, the teacher professionalism model does not necessarily infer that parents are powerless vis a vis the school (Glatter & Woods, 1992). Under choice arrangements, parents may not necessarily be involved in school decision making. "Yet in different terms, choice offers individual families more power than even direct participation in decisions would offer: Participation does not always assure influence, but the right to place one's child in a school one has chosen--and to remove that child if sufficiently motivated to do so--carries a guarantee of personal efficacy" (Raywid, 1990, p.190).

A second model of the interrelationships between parents and teachers suggests a *parent empowerment model*. In this model, parents are actively involved in their child's school either as parent advocates and activists or as members of elected school councils. This model conceptualizes parents as consumers who are actively engaged in influencing school processes and outcomes. These parents, as individuals or collectives, often exercise political influence or make demands on the school for change (e.g., Hollister, 1979). According to this model, parents engage in oversight or "checking" activities making sure that their child's needs are being met. Similarly, in a parent empowerment model of parent-teacher relations, parents can form pressure groups that campaign on their behalf, exercise their right to vote or become candidates for office; and they can seek enforcement of their rights through the courts (Woods, 1993).

In a study in Great Britain of continual conflict between members of school governing boards and school leaders, Deem and Brehony (1993) found that conflict most frequently arose over instructional matters such as exam results, teaching methods, and staffing problems, issues about which board members had little knowledge and understanding. These conflicts generally arose because of a difference in values and philosophy between school leaders and individual board members. In addition, data indicated that the key issues in disputes included membership in political parties, social class, individual experience of schooling, and ethnicity.

In extrapolating these findings and applying them to educators in general, it seems that where parents choose to challenge schooling practices, educators have the responsibility to provide information and to instruct parents about the school's philosophy, teachers' professional interests, and other educational issues. Too often, educators present a nonrational response to parents' needs and concerns and treat educational issues uncritically. The bureaucratic response of institutionalized ritual and ceremony that characterizes much of schooling may be increasingly unacceptable to today's more educated parent (Meyer & Rowan, 1978). Administrators and teachers who are not willing to set clear goals and rationally explain decisions, nor instruct parents about the schooling process and their own individual philosophies and interests are likely to loose parent support and experience continual school

turmoil. Under the parent empowerment model whereby parents' challenge the school's educational practices, educators loose respectability and credibility that weakens their participation in appropriate decision-making roles.

The third model is referred to as a *dual partnership*, or *dual empowerment* model (Glatter & Woods, 1992). This model differs from the others in that both parents and teachers are viewed as "part of a participatory community with 'external' as well as internal participants "(p. 7). In this model all stakeholders are empowered to have increased influence.

It is important to note that much of the literature related to participatory decision making is nontheoretical and hortatory in nature (Tallerico, 1993). Estler (1988) points out that traditional thinking about participatory decision making is driven primarily by attitudes, values, and beliefs, not by conclusive research results nor explanatory theory. Furthermore, much of the educational research on participatory decision-making relates to teachers and administrators. Nonetheless, there are several conceptualizations based in management theory that are relevant to the notion of dual empowerment of teachers and parents.

First, Barnard (1938), Simon (1957), and Bridges (1967) developed the concept of "zones of acceptance/indifference." Zones may be thought of as ranges within which subordinates accept the decision making authority of superordinates. If a decision falls outside the zone of acceptance, then the

subordinate's participation is considered undesirable. The difficulty is to know which decisions fall where on the continuum range. Bridges (1967) and Hoy and Miskel (1982) suggest that it may be possible for educators to gauge zones of acceptance by evaluating subordinates' personal stake and capability of contributing to particular decision areas. The limitations of this approach are not only concerned with when and how participatory decision making is appropriate but also the extent to which educators need to involve parents, and administrators need to involve teachers. A further limitation is that this conceptualization is deeply steeped in the bureaucratic model of schooling and views both teachers and parents as "subordinates" rather than as partners.

Second, a more promising body of literature found in the corporate world recognizes the dysfunctional nature of the bureaucratic model for many organizations including schools. Theorists such as Peters and Waterman (1982), Deming (1986), Senge (1990), and Watkins and Marsick (1993) have developed concepts of shared decision making, collaborative cultures, and the development of the learning organization that are likely to lead to desired outcomes while respecting and supporting the growth of the individual. The underlying assumption is that, while organizational outcomes are important, people and their individual growth and development needs are more important.

Third, a growing body of literature on "empowerment" incorporates important notions about developing collaborative

cultures and learning organizations. This literature views empowerment as a belief in self-determination (Deci, 1975), or a belief in personal self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Kanungo (1988) proposed that empowerment be viewed as meaning "to enable" rather than simply "to delegate." He states:

> Enabling implies the creation of conditions which heightens the motivation for task accomplishment through the development of a strong sense of personal efficacy. The moral justification for empowerment strategies lies in viewing empowerment as an enabling, rather than as a delegating process. Alienation, or a sense of powerlessness, cripples the workers by "disabling" them; empowerment, or an enhancement of self-efficacy, develops workers by "enabling" them. Managerial practices which cripples workers' potential are morally wrong, but empowerment practices which develop workers' potential are ethical imperatives..."(p. 418).

In applying this conceptualization of empowerment to teachers and to parents, it seems clear that neither can effectively perform their respective tasks of education without this form of empowerment. A major premise underlying this conceptualization is that an enterprise functions best if all stakeholders participate in decisions affecting them and their work. Levin (1987) elucidates this idea well by showing how this assumption is readily translatable into a set of assumptions applicable to

teachers, but easily extended to parents assuming that parents are also stakeholders in the educational enterprise:

> (a) The farther decisions are removed from the classrooms and schools where they will be implemented, the less sensitive they will be to the needs of students and schools; (b) the school must take responsibility for educational outcomes....sharing "ownership" of them; and (c) it is important to avoid underutilization of the talent of the school-based teaching force (p. 73).

For a dual empowerment model to work, parents, too, need to be viewed as able to make decisions about the needs of their own children, need to take ownership and responsibility for educational outcomes, and need to have their talents enlisted in the guidance of their own children's development and in the success of the schooling enterprise.

These three models help predict the hypothesized relationships that could be found in different types of schools of choice, given the extent to which teachers and parents work together and are accountable for students' learning. The specific question posed by this research asks: What is the relationship between parent participation and teacher empowerment under different choice arrangements? Under a teacher professionalism model, teachers have the greater power whereas under a parent empowerment model, parents exercise a high level of authority and influence. A dual partnership model suggests that teachers and parents work together collaboratively, and as a

community, take responsibility for the quality of education children receive.

Methodology

The study reported here is part of a larger, ongoing study of schools and families being conducted in metropolitan high schools of choice located in Chicago, Washington, DC, and Chattanooga, Tennessee. The study includes data collected through on-site observations, school document analysis, individual semi-structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and school administrators. This study examines three types of urban high schools of choice: Catholic, single-focus magnet, and multi-focus magnet public schools. To be included in the project, schools had to meet the following criteria: (1) serve a large proportion of minority or low-income students, (2) admit all or a portion of their students through choice and a formal application process, and (3) draw a large portion of students from inner city areas. Data were collected from both teachers and parents (cf., Goldring & Bauch, 1993; Goldring & Bauch, 1995).

This study examines fifteen high schools of choice: six Catholic, four single-focus, and five multi-focus. The six urban Catholic schools range in size from 325 to 767 students with an average of 12% of families with incomes below the poverty level. Three of the schools are private and three are diocesan. The three private schools serve 30%, 86%, and 100% minority students, respectively. The diocesan schools serve 60% to 100% minority

students, primarily African-American or Hispanic. The six Catholic schools enroll 100% of their student body in college preparatory programs. The diocesan high schools tend to be larger than the private schools and offer programs in college prep, business, and general education, although all students take an academic program.

The four single-focus magnet schools are organized academically around a single theme and are among the smaller schools in the study. One focuses on arts and sciences serving 400 students of whom 42% are African-American. The second school focuses its programs around the agricultural sciences. It serves 240 students from primarily middle and upper-middle income families, of whom 67% are African-American and 22% are Hispanic. The third and fourth schools organize their curricular programs around college preparation and the performing arts, respectively. They both enroll 100% African-American students also primarily from middle- to upper-middle income families. In these four schools, approximately 10% of students come from families below the poverty level.

The five multi-focus magnet schools are large, comprehensive high schools organized primarily to achieve racial desegregation. They range in size from 2150 to 3400 students. These schools are highly complex in their organization offering a wide array of academic and vocational programs for neighborhood students including drop-out prevention programs, programs for the Gifted and Talented as well as one or more magnet programs for students

whose parents choose the school. The magnet programs included in these schools seek to prepare students for careers in the visual and performing arts or to enter college with a preparation in science and technology, language and international studies, or the humanities, respectively. While these schools are intended to bring about racial integration, only one serves a diversity of students of whom approximately 11% come from families below the poverty level. The others serve predominately minority students of whom approximately 18% come from families below the poverty level. The population of magnet programs in these schools is far different from the general school population. They attract middle- and upper-middle class white students from across the city. Overall, only about 20% of a multi-focus magnet schools' population is enrolled in the magnet program.

Sample

All teachers assigned to academic teaching areas (i.e., math, English, science, social studies, and foreign language) were given questionnaires to complete and return anonymously in a sealed envelope to a central collection point at the school, usually located in a mailbox area or the teachers' lounge. Teachers also had the choice of mailing their completed surveys to the researchers, which a few in each school did. The overall teacher response rate was 50%. Single-focus public magnet schools had the highest response rate (68%) followed by Catholic schools (52%) and multi-focus schools (30%). All teachers had an equal chance to complete and return the survey. A comparison of

the demographic characteristics and teaching assignments of teachers who returned surveys with this information as reported at each school by school personnel indicated that the teachers who did not respond to the survey shared similar characteristics and assignments.

To obtain parent data, in each school all twelfth grade students were given questionnaires to hand deliver to their parents and return in a sealed envelope to a central collection point at the school upon completion. In most cases, homeroom teachers served as the collection point for a particular group of students, while in other schools surveys were deposited in a designated area. The total parent response rate across all schools was 56% (N = 661). Specifically, Catholic schools returned 60% (N = 265) of the delivered surveys, single-focus magnet schools and multi-focus magnet schools returned 52% (N = 85) and 42% (N = 311), respectively. Although the response rate may raise some concerns, further analysis of the data indicate that the respondents are similar to parents who chose these schools.

Although sample returns suggest that the sample is demographically representative of the sample as a whole, it is impossible to rule out the impact of self-selection and it's relationship to both teacher empowerment and parent involvement. Teachers and parents who are more involved in the school may be more wiling to complete questionnaires than those who are less involved. In contrast, uninvolved teachers who dislike parent

involvement and parents who have little communication with the school may have viewed the questionnaire as an opportunity to express their feelings. Both those who were involved and satisfied as well as uninvolved and dissatisfied had the same opportunity to respond. Nevertheless, we must be cautious in interpreting the results of this study.

Instrumentation

The initial parent survey for this research was based on questions used in previous surveys which examined relationships between parents and schools (Becher, 1984; Erickson & Kamin, 1980; Goodlad, 1983; Hess & Hollcway, 1984; Horn & West, 1992; National Catholic Education Association, 1986). Revised versions of the original questionnaire were used in a series of studies which examined Catholic schools regionally and nationally (Bauch, 1987, 1988; Bauch & Small, 1986; Bauch, et al., 1985). Questions from the parent survey were adapted for the teacher survey and additional questions examining school organization and climate were added based on information gathered from previously-held site-visits and interviews of parents, students, and teachers. The teacher and parent surveys were subsequently piloted in Spring 1991 in public schools of choice as well as Catholic schools (Bauch & Cibulka, 1988). Based on these earlier analyses, final adjustments were made to the questionnaire.

Variables

This exploratory study presents the results of a descriptive analysis regarding the relationship between parent participation

and teacher empowerment under three different types of choice arrangements: Catholic, single-focus, and multi-focus public magnet schools. The study focuses on two sets of variables: teacher empowerment and parent participation. Here we define teacher empowerment more broadly than the teacher expertise associated with professionalism, but to include participation in schoolwide decisions.

Five variables were included in the parent participation set. The first variable measures a traditional and passive type of parent involvement, parent participation in and attendance at school events, such as attending school meetings and participation in fundraising (α = .87). In this role, parents indirectly support the school through their participation and involvement.

The second parent participation variable indicates the level of parent involvement in activities specifically related to their child's education; that is, checking or oversight activities such as visiting their child's classroom, coming to school to pick up their child's report card, or to straighten out a school problem (α = .69). This variable seeks to determine the extent to which parents exercise the role of consumer by taking charge of an aspect of their child's education by overseeing, monitoring, observing, communicating, and problem-solving (cf. Woods, 1993).

The third variable measures the extent to which parents report that the school seeks their advice in making school decisions on a variety of issues (i.e., finances, programs,

personnel, policy, and goals) (α = .93). This variable approximates the notion of parents acting, at least informally, in governance or decision making roles. It represents a school-based mechanism for providing parental input in to school decisions.

The fourth variable reports the extent to which parents indicate they have open, responsive communication with the school (α =. 73). This variable includes the notion that the school makes efforts to insure "good" communication between home and school and that parents perceive the school as a friendly, open, place. This variable assesses the potential for parent involvement by measuring the communication climate of the school.

The final variable in the parent participation set is one item that asked parents to report their agreement with the statement, "This school provides adequate opportunities for parents to be involved." This variable measures the extent to which parents perceive that the school provides strategies and mechanisms for involving parents.

Three measures comprise the teacher empowerment set. The first variable measures teacher reports about the level of influence teachers have in decision making in the school regarding the areas of budget, programs, and staffing (α = .82). The second indicates the number of years of teaching in the particular school, while the third measures the teachers' highest level of educational attainment. A summary of the variables in the analysis are presented in Table 1.

(Table 1)

The intercorrelation matrices for the variables in the analyses are presented in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

Canonical correlation was used to explore the relationships among the multiple parent participation measures and teacher empowerment variables for the three different choice arrangements--Catholic, single-focus, and multi-focus public magnet schools. Three separate canonical analyses were conducted for each of the choice arrangements. This methodology was selected because the interest in this study concerned the strength of the interrelationships between the sets of multiple variables. Canonical correlation analysis creates two new variates, one from the five variables of parent participation and one from the teacher empowerment variables and considers the relationship between the two. The canonical correlation measures the strength of the overall relationship between the linear composites of the two sets of variables. The analysis also determines weights, or contribution, of each variable in the set. A strong relationship indicates a highly-shared variance.

Results

Canonical Results for Catholic Schools

As indicated in Table 2, parents of Catholic school students reported moderate levels of parental involvement in both school participation activities ($\bar{X}$ = 2.49, SD = .94) and child-centered areas related to checking and overseeing their child's education ($\bar{X}$

= 2.40, SD = 1.05). Parents indicated, however, that they had little influence in decision making areas (X = 2.08, SD = .94), while they perceived their communication transactions with the school as open and responsive (X = 3.63, SD = .82). Parents agreed, nonetheless, that the school offers adequate opportunities for parents to be involved (X = 3.68, SD = 1.07).

Similarly, teachers in Catholic schools reported moderate levels of influence in decision making (X = 2.86, SD = .14). On average, they have eight years of experience (X = 7.99, SD = .14) and typically hold a BA or MA degree (X = 2.31, SD = .34).[1]

(Table 2)

Canonical correlation explores how these levels of parent participation and teacher empowerment interrelate with each other. Three canonical functions were derived from the analysis; however, the first function yielded both statistical significance and meaningful relationships and hence was the only function interpreted. The results of the first analysis are presented in Table 3. Shown in the table are the loadings (correlations) between the variables and the canonical variate, standardized canonical variate coefficients, within-set variance accounted for by the canonical variate, redundancies, and the canonical correlation for Catholic schools.

(Table 3)

The analysis yielded a canonical correlation (R^2) of .513 ($p<.0001$) indicating that levels of parental participation are associated with levels of teacher empowerment in Catholic schools,

and that there is 26 percent shared variance between the parental participation variables and teacher empowerment variables.

The decision rules used for significant factor loadings recommend that a correlation between variables and variate (loadings) in excess of .3 be interpreted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). The variables in the parental involvement set that are correlated with the canonical variate are parent advice in decision making, parent involvement in the school, child-centered parent involvement, and assessment of opportunity for parent involvement. Among the teacher set of variables, all three correlated with the canonical variate.

The specific loadings indicate that in Catholic schools, more involvement in school events (.517), and an overall sense of opportunity for parental involvement (. 434), but less involvement with a child's educational issues (-.432), and less influence in decision making (-.411), correspond with high levels of teacher influence in decision making (.903), and more seniority (.527).

The canonical variate pair (correlation) extracts 16 percent of the variance from the parental participation set of variables and 40 percent of the variance from the teacher empowerment variables. The redundancy index indicates that the parental involvement variate accounts for four percent of the variance in the teacher empowerment variables, while the teacher empowerment variate accounts for 11 percent of the variance in the parental involvement set.

Overall, in Catholic schools, these results suggest that a combination of more involvement in school activities and opportunity for involvement, but less participation in decision making and less involvement around child-centered education issues, correspond with high teacher professionalism and empowerment,. specifically, teacher involvement in decision making and high seniority.

Canonical Results for Single-Focus Magnet Schools

Parents in single-focus magnet schools also report moderate levels of parental involvement in school activities (X = 2.53, SD = .91) and indicate that communication is very open (X = 3.75, SD = .66). (See Table 2.) They suggest there is relatively low influence in decision making (X = 2.23, SD = .96), but extremely high opportunities for parental involvement (X = 4.28, SD = .87). They indicate moderate levels of influence in decision making (X = 2.74, SD = .22). Teachers in single-focus magnet schools have approximately five years of teaching experience in their schools (X = 4.60) and hold, on the average, a BA or MA degree ((X = 3.03, SD = .21).

The canonical analysis for single focus-magnet schools yielded a canonical correlation of .545, indicating that parental participation and teacher empowerment are significantly correlated ($p < .0001$), as presented in Table 4. The loadings suggest that low levels of parental involvement in school events (-.732), and low levels of assessment that the school provides adequate opportunities for parental involvement (-.505), are associated with

low levels of teacher empowerment in terms of influence in decision making (-.668) and level of education (.-453).

(Table 4)

The canonical correlation pair extracts 17 percent of the variance from parental involvement and 29 percent of the variance from teacher empowerment. The redundancy index indicates that the parental involvement variate accounts for five percent of the variance in the teacher empowerment variables, while the teacher empowerment variate accounts for nine percent of the variance in the parental involvement set. Overall, in single-focus magnet schools, low levels of parental involvement seem to be associated with low levels of empowerment.

Canonical Correlation Results for Multi-Focus Magnet Schools

Parents in multi-focus magnet schools report relatively low levels of parent involvement in school events (X = 2.07, SD = .93), but higher levels of involvement in child-centered educational issues (X = 2.41, SD = 1.11). (See Table 2.) Parents suggest that school communication is moderately open (X = 3.29, SD = .77); however, the school infrequently seeks their advice in decision making (X = 1.93, SD = .88), and provides moderate opportunities for parental involvement (X = 3.27, SD = .99). Teachers in multi-focus magnet schools have eleven years of teacher experience (X = 10.44), SD = 234), and are most likely to hold BA degrees (X = 3.08, SD = 14). They report low levels of involvement in decision making (X = 2.03, SD = .15).

The canonical correlation between the two sets of variables for the multi-focus schools is .597, indicating a significant association between teacher empowerment and parental involvement (p. <.0001). The structure coefficients, presented in Table 5, indicate that low levels of teacher empowerment in terms of influence in decision making (-.944), few years of seniority (-.782) and low levels of education (-.634) are associated with high levels of parental involvement in school events (.428), but low levels of involvement in child-related issues (-.729).

(Table 5)

The canonical correlation pair extracts 16 percent of the variance from parental involvement and 63 percent of the variance from teacher empowerment. The redundancy index indicates that the parental involvement variate accounts for six percent of the variance in the teacher empowerment variables, while the teacher empowerment variate accounts for 22 percent of the variance in the parental involvement set. Thus, in multi-focus magnet schools low levels of teacher empowerment are associated with high levels of parental participation in school events, but low levels of parental involvement in their child's educational issues.

Summary of Results

A summary of the results of the canonical correlation analyses is presented in Table 6. The findings suggest different patterns of relationships between parent participation and teacher empowerment in each of the three types of choice arrangements. These patterns of relationships are only suggestive of aspects of

the parent-teacher relations models presented earlier. The findings more accurately identify the conditions that might foster one or other of the models described in the different types of schools rather then identifying any one particular model.

Catholic schools seem to be characterized by high levels of parent involvement at the school level both in supportive roles through participation in school events and in parents' perceptions that the school provides adequate opportunities for parent involvement. However, these schools are also characterized by low levels of parent advice-seeking, but high levels of teacher empowerment, as also found by Johnson (1991) in her interviews of private school teachers who experienced greater autonomy in decision making than public school teachers.

The analyses of parent and teacher interviews, currently undertaken in a related project, reveal that while Catholic school parents have great respect for the authority of the teacher, they also perceive teachers as "approachable" and "caring." Teachers in these schools in turn view their relationships with parents as "familiar" and "friendly." Given the greater autonomy perceived by teachers in Catholic schools, and the long tradition of parental choice, it is likely that Catholic schools, more than single-focus and multi-focus magnet schools could approximate a dual empowerment or partnership model of parent-teacher relations; or at least, provide the conditions under which such a model could develop.

In contrast, in single-focus magnet schools, low levels of parental involvement in the school are negatively associated with

teacher empowerment. In these schools, the findings suggest a relationship whereby high levels of parent involvement in school related-areas including involvement in school activities and parents' perceptions of the opportunities the school provides for parent involvement and the school's openness to parent communication are associated with relatively low levels of teacher empowerment, especially in terms of teacher seniority.

Site-visit observations and interviews revealed the political and financial vulnerability of the single-focus magnet public schools in this study. All the single-focus magnet schools were established within a six-year period prior to the study, were highly dependent upon perceptions of public support for their continuation, and financially dependent on district and state mandates as to whether funding would be available from year to year. In their districts, these schools tended to be treated as experimental and were exempt from some bureaucratic rules, thus increasing their vulnerability and thereby sensitizing them to parents' needs, perceptions, and support. More than Catholic or multi-focus magnet schools, these conditions suggest a market-driven or consumer model of parent-teacher relations whereby the school appears to lean toward the parent empowerment model, or at least the conditions that might support parent empowerment are more present here than in the other two types of choice arrangements.

Finally, in multi-focus magnet schools, moderate levels of parent involvement are negatively associated with teacher empowerment. Parents in multi-focus magnet schools are the least

likely, compared to Catholic and single-focus magnet schools, to have their advice sought in decision making, to be involved in school activities, to rate parent-school communication as "good," and to report that the school provides adequate opportunities for involvement. Teachers in these magnet schools, however, have high levels of seniority and higher levels of education than teachers under the other two choice arrangement plans, although they report lower levels of participation in decision making. Teacher professionalism based on high levels of teacher socialization as measured by number of years at the school and low levels of parent involvement suggest the conditions necessary for describing a teacher professionalism model of parent-teacher relations.

While these findings do not lend themselves to a complete explanation of the models of parent-teacher relationships they purportedly represent, they do suggest the presence or absence of some conditions that may be necessary for such models to operate.

Conclusion

In summarizing the findings for each school type, Catholic schools appear to have a superior advantage over single-focus and multi-focus public magnet schools in developing dual empowerment or partnership models of parent-teacher relations. Historically, Catholic schools have worked collaboratively with parents emphasizing the role parents play in the education of their children. Parents are viewed as the primary educators of their children with the schools playing a supporting role. Due to their focused mission, Catholic schools have more clearly defined goals,

less bureaucracy and greater autonomy in their organizational structuring than public schools. These elements, no doubt, contribute to the formation of collaborative relations between home and school.

Both low teacher and parent empowerment in the single-focus magnet schools may indicate that these schools are still negotiating with parents, and with the public, about their role in the educational arena. Due to their financial and political vulnerability, these schools may be more open to parents' views and participation than Catholic schools who can count on support from a basic, established, religious community. In contrast, however, they may not know their clientele as well as Catholic schools do and therefore they may be more hesitant to either empower parents or empower themselves. The single-focus magnet schools in this study were attempting to establish their identities in the community through public relations and outreach programs. They were also involved with parents in lobbying city and state governments for increased budget considerations for their specific schools.

Finally, while multi-focus magnet schools are most likely to embody vestiges of teacher professionalism, these latter school types, due to their larger size, multiple school goals, and the diversity of their student bodies, are more incumbered in their efforts at parent-teacher relations. Nevertheless, parents were beginning to play a larger role in these schools, almost in reaction to the tight hold parents perceived teachers had over the

curriculum and other matters over the years. As local school councils were developing in Chicago at the time of this study, teachers were being denied seats on them.[2] In the Washington, DC area schools, parents were playing a more prominent role in school decisions through councils, committees, and fundraising efforts than they had played previously, according to administrators' reports. This was attributed to parents' interest in helping the schools improve and lessening the negative image that often portrays these large, urban, public high schools.[3] These magnet schools are suggestive of a transitioning into the parent empowerment model. While school officials wanted parents to be involved in the school, parents wanted to be more involved than they were currently allowed.[4]

None of our school types appear to exemplify high teacher empowerment accompanied by low parent involvement, the teacher empowerment model.

This study raises an important question associated with site-based management and other types of school improvement plans that involve parents: Can teachers and parents work together effectively in a balanced power relationship? Teachers may need to function in new roles that substantially depart from their familiar role of knowledge expert within a self-contained class, teaching many students simultaneously in a large group. Consequently, parents may need to become more knowledgeable about schools and how they are organized in order to interact effectively with teachers. Organizationally, schools need to develop a culture of caring and

community that will support its members to meet high expectations and build collective meaning and commitment to the community itself (Newmann & Oliver, 1967; Noddings, 1984). Such efforts have been attributed, primarily to Catholic schools, but also to some public schools, in which schools act to reduce alienation and improve the sense of community (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993; Driscoll, 1993; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987). Some fundamental shifts in thinking, however, may be necessary before a century and a half of authoritarian and bureaucratic public school control can be replaced by an inclusiveness of decision making that empowers all its members (e.g. Bellah, et al., 1991; Etzioni, 1988).

Given the developing interest in within-school collaboration and a focus on the development of school partnerships with parents, research efforts need to be more clearly-focused than this study was, to uncover the elements that contribute to <u>all</u> teachers and <u>all</u> parents working together for the improvement of student learning.

Notes

1. The coding for this latter analysis was as follows: 1 = Less than B. A. or B. S.; 2 = B. A. or B. S.; 3 = B. A. or B. S. + 15 credits; 4 = M. A. or M. S.; 5 = M. A. or M. S. + 30 credits; 6 = Educational Specialist, 7 = Doctorate.

2. At one of the magnet schools in this study, the first act of the newly-elected Local School Council (LSC) was the decision not to renew the contract of the principal. The teachers sided with the principal in this controversy while parents sided with the LSC. Teachers appeared to be loosing power while parents were in the process of gaining it.

3. When the Reagan administration was looking for an outstanding urban school to exemplify in the media, one of the schools in this study was so chosen and received a visit from President Reagan.

4. This was evident in the parent interviews we conducted at these magnet schools. For example, parents were frustrated that a teacher about whom they had complained was removed from the classroom, but not from the school and that no replacement teacher had been hired.

References

Bacharach, S., & Lawler, E.(1980). Power and politics in organizations: The social psychology of conflict, coalitions, and bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive view. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barnard, C. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bauch, P. A. (1987). Family choice and parent involvement in inner-city Catholic high schools: An exploration of parent psychosocial and school organizational factors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC reproduction document service

Bauch, P. A. (1988). Is parent involvement different in private schools? Educational Horizons, 66(2), 78-82.

Bauch, P. A. (1993). Improving education for minority adolescents: Toward an ecological perspective on school choice. In N. F. Chavkin (Ed.), Families and schools in a pluralistic society (pp. 121-146). New York: State University of New York Press.

Bauch, P. A., & Cibulka, J. G. (1989). Family choice and school responsiveness: A study of parent involvement in Catholic and public high schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Funded Grant #R117E80031-88.

Bauch, P. A., & Goldring, E. B. (1993). Teacher work context and opportunities for parent involvement in urban high schools of choice: A view from the inside. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston.

Bauch, P. A., & Goldring, E. B. (1995). Parent involvement and school responsiveness: Facilitating the home-school connection in schools of choice. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17(1), .

Bauch, P. A., Blum, I., Taylor, N., & Valli, L. (1985). Final report to the National Catholic Educational Association on a field study of five low-income-serving schools. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America.

Bauch, P. A., & Small, T. W. (1986). Parents' reasons for school choice in four inner-city Catholic high schools: Their relationship to education, income and ethnicity. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Becher, R. S. (1984). Parent involvement: A review of research and principles of successful practice. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, National Institute of Education. (ERIC Reproduction Document Service, ED 247 032).

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1991). The good society. New York: Knopf.

Benson, P. L., Yeager, R. J., Wood, P. K., Guerra, M. J., & Manno, B. V. (1986). Catholic high schools: Their impact on low-income students. Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.

Blank, R., & Others. (1983). Survey of magnet schools--Final report: Analyzing a model for quality integrated education. Washington, DC: James H. Lowry & Associates.

Bownen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how and when. Sloan Management Review, 33 (3), 31-39.

Bridges, E. M. (1967). A model for shared decision-making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 49-61.

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). The high school as community: Contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers. Madison: WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). Catholic schools and the common good. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A. S., Easton, J. Q., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S. G., & Sebring, P. A. (1993). A view from the elementary schools: The state of reform in Chicago. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, The Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Bryk, A. S., Easton, J. Q., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S. G., & Sebring, P. A. (1994). The state of Chicago school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(1), 74-78.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Chrispeels, J. (January 1991). District leadership in parent involvement: Policies and actions in San Diego. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 367-71.

Clarke, R., & Williams, R. (1992). The importance of parental involvement as perceived by beginning teachers vs. experienced teachers. Bloomsburg, PA: Bloomsburg University (ERIC ED 347 129).

Conley, D. (1993). Roadmap to restructuring: Policies, practices and the emerging visions of schooling. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Conley, S. (1991). Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. In G. Grant (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, Volume 17 (pp. 225-226). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Clune, W. H., & White, P. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick: NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Coleman, J. (1987). Families and schools. Educational Researcher 16(6), 32-38.

Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). Public and private high schools: The impact of communities. New York: Basic Books.

Conley, S., & Bacharach, S. (1990). From school site management to participatory school site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

Coons, J. E., & Sugarman, S. D. (1978). Education by choice: The case for family control. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). Politics, markets, & America's schools. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher professionalism: Why and how? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now (pp. 25-50). New York: The Falmer Press.

deCharms, R. (1968). Personal causation. New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L. (1975). Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. (1993). Can consumers and education professionals work together in running schools? In F. Smit,

W. van Esch, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Parental involvement in education (pp. 5-14). The Netherlands: Nijmegen.

Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Driscoll, M. E. (1993). Choice, achievement, and school community. In E. Rasell & R. Rothstein (Eds.), School choice: Examining the evidence. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Elmore, R. F. (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Epstein, J. (1984). School policy and parent involvement: Research results. Educational Horizons, 62, 70-72.

Epstein, J., & Dauber, S. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. Elementary School Journal, 91, 289-306.

Erickson, D. A., & Kamin, J. (1980). How parents choose schools for their children. Report to the National Institute of Education and the British Columbia Ministry of Education. San Francisco: University of San Francisco, Institute for Private Education.

Estler, S. (1988). Decision making. In N. L. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 305-320). New York: Longman.

Etzioni, A. (1988). The moral dimension: Toward a new economics. New York: Free Press.

Friedman, M., & Friedman, R. (1980). Free to choose. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Garman, N. B., & Hazi, H. M. (1988). Teachers ask: Is there life after Madeline Hunter? Phi Delta Kappan, (May), 671.

Glatter, R., & Woods, P. (1992). Parental choice and school decision-making: Operating in a market-like environment. Paper presented at the 7th regional conference for the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, University of Hong Kong.

Glickman, C. D. (1987). Effective schools: What do we want? Phi Delta Kappan, (April), 622-24.

Golby, M. (1993). Parents as school governors. In P. Munn (Ed.), Parents and schools (pp. 65-86). London: Routledge.

Goldring, E. B., & Shapira, R. (1993). Choice, empowerment, and involvement: What satisfies parents? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 15(4), 396-409.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hallinger, P., & Richardson, D. (1988). Models of shared leadership: Evolving structures and relationships. The Urban Review, 20(4), 229-245.

Henderson, A. (1987). The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hess, G. A., Jr. (1991). Chicago and Britain: Experiments in empowering parents. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 334 644)

Hess, R. D., & Holloway, S. D. (1984). Family and school as educational institutions. In R. D. Parke (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research, 7, 179-222.

Hiatt, D. B. (1993). Parent involvement in American public schools: An historical perspective 1642-1992. In F. Smit, W. van Esch, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Parental involvement in education (pp. 5-14). The Netherlands: Nijmegen.

Hill, P. T., & Bonan, J. (1991). Decentralization and accountability in public education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Hollister, C. D. (1979). School bureaucratization as a response to parents' demands. Urban Education, 14, 221-235.

Horn, L., & West, J. (1992). A profile of parents of eighth graders. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Jaynes, J. H, & Wlodkowski, R. J. (1990). Eager to learn: Helping children become motivated and love learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Teachers, power, and school change. In W. H. Clune, & J. F. Witte (Eds.), Choice and control in American education vol. 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring (pp. 343-370). New York: The Falmer Press.

Kanungo, R. N. (1992). Alienation and empowerment: Some ethical imperatives in business. Journal of Business Ethics, 11, 413- 422.

Levin, H. M. (1987). New schools. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(4), 60-83.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, M. (1989). Privatization and educational choice. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1981). Toward conflict and resolution: Relationships between families and schools. Theory into Practice, 20, 97-103.

Lindle, J., & Boyd, W. L. (1991). Parents, professionalism, and partnership in school-community relations. The International Journal of Educational Research, 15(3/4), 323-337.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macbeth, A. (1993). School-family relations in the countries of the European community. In F. Smit, W. van Esch, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Parental involvement in education (pp. 49-58).The Netherlands: Nijmegen.

Madigan, T. J. (1994). Parent involvement and school achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(4), 251-270.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature--A call for research. In W. H. Clune, & J. F. Witte (Eds.), Choice and control in American education vol. 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring (pp. 289-342). New York: Falmer Press.

Marburger, C. L. (1985). One school at a time. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In M. W. Meyer, & Others (Eds.), Environments and organizations (pp. 78-109). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Montandon, C. (1993). Parent-teacher relations in Genevan primary schools: The roots of misunderstanding. In F. Smit, W. van Esch, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Parental involvement in education (pp. 5-14). The Netherlands: Nijmegen.

Moore, D. R., & Davenport, S. (1989). Cheated again: School choice and students at risk. The School administrator, ( ),

Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D., & Ecob, B. (1988). School matters. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Munn, P. (1993). Parents and schools. London: Routledge.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring: Capturing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Newmann, F. M., & Oliver, D. W. (1967) Education and community. Harvard Educational Review, 37(1), 61-106.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). School reform: A review. The Elementary School Journal, 85(4), 353-389.

Raywid, M. A (1990). Rethinking school governance. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rolf, R. K. (1990). Educational effects of magnet high schools. In W. H. Clune & J. F. Witte (Eds.), Choice and control in American education, volume 2: The Practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring. New York: The Falmer Press.

Saxe, R. (1975). School-community interaction. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Schneider, B., & Slaughter, D. (forthcoming). Parents and school life: Varieties of parent participation. In P. A. Bauch (Ed.), Private schools and the public interest: Research and policy issues. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Seeley, D. S. (1993). Why home-school partnership is difficult in bureaucratic schools. In F. Smit, W. van Esch, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Parental involvement in education (pp. 49-58). The Netherlands: Nijmegen.

Seeley, D. S. (October 1989). A new paradigm for parent involvement. Educational Leadership, 46-49.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Simon, A. (1965). Administrative behavior. New York: Free Press.

Smith, M. S., & O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. H. Furhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing(pp. 233-267). New York: Falmer Press.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decisionmaking: Assessing willingness to participate. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14(1), 53-67.

Stallworth, J. T., & Williams, D. L., Jr. (1982). A survey of parents regarding parent involvement in schools. Austin TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Swick, K. (1991). Teacher-Parent partnerships to enhance school success in early childhood education. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sykes, G. (1990). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educaticnal reform (pp. 59-96). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.

Tallerico, M. (1993). Governing urban schools. In P. B. Forsyth & M. Tallerico (Eds.), City schools: Leading the way (pp. 211-252). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1993). Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systemic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Witte, J. F., Bailey, A. B, & Thorne, C. A. (1993). Third year report: Milwaukee parental choice program. Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin, Robert LaFollette institute of Public Affairs.

Woods, P. (1993). Parents as consumer-citizens. In R. Merttens, D. Mayers, A. Brown, & J. Vass, J. (Eds.), Ruling the margins: Problematising parental involvement. London: University of North London, Institute of Education.

TA

Descriptive Statistics of Va

Variables
Parent Participation
Involvement in school
Involvement in child's education
Advice in decision making
Home-school communication
Opportunities for involvement
Teacher Empowerment
Influence in decision making
Seniority
Education

BLE 1

riables in the Analysis (*N*=661)

		Range	
Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
2.27	.96	1.00	5.00
2.43	1.07	1.00	5.00
2.03	.92	1.00	5.00
3.46	.81	1.00	5.00
3.57	1.06	1.00	5.00
2.45	.43	1.90	2.95
8.74	3.36	3.13	16.14
2.78	.45	1.67	3.45

TABLE

Means and Standard Deviations of the Va

Variables	Catholic (N= $\bar{X}$	
Parent Participation		
Involvement in school	2.49	
Involvement in child's education	2.40	(
Advice in decision making	2.08	
Home-school communication	3.63	
Opportunities for involvement	3.68	(
Teacher Empowerment		
Influence in decision making	2.86	
Seniority	7.99	(
Education	2.31	

2

riables by Three Choice Arrangements

265)	Single-Focus (*N*=85)		Multi-Focus (*N*=311)	
SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
.94)	2.53	(.91)	2.07	(.93)
.05)	2.41	(.89)	2.41	(1.11)
.94)	2.23	(.96)	1.93	(.88)
.82)	3.75	(.66)	3.29	(.77)
.07)	4.28	(.87)	3.27	(.99)
.14)	2.74	(.22)	2.03	(.15)
3.37)	4.60	(1.81)	10.44	(2.34)
.34)	3.02	(.21)	3.08	(.14)

TABL

Standardized canonical coefficients, structure
participation and teacher empowerment variable
for Catholic Schools

Variables	
Parent Participation	
Involvement in school	
Involvement in child's education	
Advice in decision making	
Home-school communication	
Opportunities for involvement	
Percent of variance	
Redundancy	
Teacher Empowerment	
Influence in decision making	
Seniority	
Education	
Percent of variance	
Redundancy	
Canonical Correlation	

E 3

coefficients, and redundancies between parent
s and their corresponding canonical variate

Coefficients	
Standardized	Structure
.747	.517
-.511	-.432
-.542	-.411
-.097	.086
.413	.434
.16	
.04	
.412	.903
.777	.527
.703	.295
.40	
.11	
.513	

TABLE

Standardized canonical coefficients, structure
participation and teacher empowerment variables
for Single Focus Magnet Schools

Variables
Parent Participation
Involvement in school
Involvement in child's education
Advice in decision making
Home-school communication
Opportunities for involvement
Percent of variance
Redundancy
Teacher Empowerment
Influence in decision making
Seniority
Education
Percent of variance
Redundancy
Canonical Correlation

4

coefficients, and redundancies between parent
and their corresponding canonical variate

Coefficients	
Standardized	Structure
-.955	-.732
.361	.099
-.454	.120
-.020	-.151
-.411	-.505
.17	
.05	
-.751	-.668
.245	.482
-.839	-.453
.29	
.09	
.545	

TABL

Standardized canonical coefficients, structure
participation and teacher empowerment variable
for Multi-Focus Schools

Variables	
Parent Participation	
Involvement in school	
Involvement in child's education	
Advice in decision making	
Home-school communication	
Opportunities for involvement	
	Percent of variance
	Redundancy
Teacher Empowerment	
Influence in decision making	
Seniority	
Education	
	Percent of variance
	Redundancy
Canonical Correlation	

E 5

coefficients, and redundancies between parent
s and their corresponding canonical variate

Coefficients	
Standardized	Structure
.675	.428
-.878	-.729
-.132	-.247
-.246	-.152
.103	.004
.16	
.06	
.262	-.944
-4.705	-.782
3.832	-.634
.63	
.22	
.597	

TAB

Summary of the Relationship Between Parent Pa
Choice Arrangements

Variables	Cath Sch
Parental Participation	
Involvement in school	
Involvement in child's education	
Advice in decision-making	
Opportunities for involvement	
Teacher Empowerment	

• below criteria for interpretation (.3)

BLE 6

rticipation and Teacher Empowerment in Three

holic ools	Single-Focus Magnet	Multi-Focus Magnet
+	-	+
-	*	-
-	*	*
+	-	*
+	-	-

Intercorrelations f

	(1) Parent Influence in Decision Making	(2) Involvement in School	(3) Involvement in Child's Education	(Commun
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS				
1	1.0000			
2	.2671*	1.0000		
3	.3157*	.3473*	1.0000	
4	.2165*	.1464*	-.0499	1.0
5	.2760*	.2575*	-.0328	.4
6	-.1529*	.2595*	-.2111*	.0
7	.0945	.3032*	-.0851	.2
8	-.3148*	-.1102	-.0974	-.1
SINGLE-FOCUS MAGNET SCHOOLS				
1	1.0000			
2	.3571*	1.0000		
3	.2660*	.3944*	1.0000	
4	.3263*	.1477	.0577	1.0
5	.2006	.1894	.0112	.3
6	-.1704	.2779*	-.0026	-.1
7	.2283	-.2102	-.0569	.1
8	.1409	.1654	-.0786	.2
MULTI-FOCUS MAGNET SCHOOLS				
1	1.0000			
2	.1622*	1.0000		
3	.2289*	.2445*	1.0000	
4	.2121*	.0719	-.0437	1.0
5	.2691*	.0648	.0298	.3
6	.1970*	-.2516*	.3951*	.0
7	.0946	-.1380*	.3882*	.0
8	.0642	-.0854	.3359*	.0

* p<.01

BEST COPY A

APPENDIX

or Variables in the Analysis

(4) ication	(5) Opportunities for Involvement	(6) Teacher Influence in Decision Making	(7) Seniority	(8) Teacher Education
000				
000*	1.0000			
189	.2289*	1.0000		
089*	.1741*	.4762*	1.0000	
794*	-.0098	.2093*	-.6359*	1.0000
000				
873*	1.0000			
647	.0572	1.0000		
917	.0430	-.8710*	1.0000	
924*	.2892*	-.3523*	.4969*	1.0000
000				
32*	1.0000			
76	-.0212	1.0000		
08	.0176	.6730*	1.0000	
24	.0237	.5116*	.9778*	1.0000

AVAILABLE

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC , *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
College of Education - Agate Hall
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500

(Rev. 9/91)